

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated April 6, 2007 (hereinafter Office Action) have been considered but are believed to be improper. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

With respect to the objection to the Abstract and in effort to facilitate prosecution, the Abstract has been amended to remove the objected-to term; however, it is noted that there is no requirement that the term "invention" not be present in the Abstract or the rest of the Specification. Applicant accordingly requests that the objection to the Abstract be removed.

Applicant respectfully traverses each of the § 103(a) rejections, each of which is based at least in part upon a combination of the teachings of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0068600 by Chihara (hereinafter "Chihara") with those of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0137552 by Cannon (hereinafter "Cannon") because the asserted references alone, or in combination do not teach or suggest each of the claimed limitations. For example, the Office Action acknowledges that Chihara does not teach a control unit of a cellular core unit configured to indicate an incoming connection request in a peripheral unit when an LPRF connection between a cellular core unit and the peripheral unit becomes available, as claimed in each of the independent claims.

In an effort to overcome this deficiency, the Office Action relies upon the teachings of Cannon; however, this reliance is misplaced. Cannon teaches that a portable device is equipped with an indication unit 100 (*e.g.*, paragraphs [0008] and [0033] as well as Fig. 3) such that the indication unit may sense when a user leaves and returns to the vicinity of the indication unit/portable device. Since the indication unit includes the identified controller 125, it appears that the identification unit in the portable device is asserted as corresponding to the claimed cellular core unit. Paragraph [0022] teaches that this vicinity sensing is accomplished by the user wearing a BLUETOOTH equipped digital watch 300 (allegedly asserted as a peripheral device). However, the cited portions of paragraph [0022] and [0023] directed to the controller 125 sending a control signal to either a received message

waiting indicator 135 or an appointment reminder message indicator 130 to notify the user of a message all takes place within indication unit 100 within the portable device. There is no indication in a peripheral device such as the watch 300. The only indication is provided by the asserted cellular core unit. In direct contrast to the claimed limitations, when communication link 310 is reestablished (asserted as corresponding to becoming available), the asserted cellular core unit provides an indication to the user, not the asserted peripheral device 300. Thus, Cannon does not teach at least a control unit of a cellular core unit configured to indicate an incoming connection request in a peripheral unit when an LPRF connection between a cellular core unit and the peripheral unit becomes available.

Moreover, Cannon has not been shown to teach indicating an incoming connection request, as claimed. Rather, Cannon is directed to notifying a user that a message was stored by a portable device while the user was away from the device. The only indication provided for the user is that of a stored message, not of incoming connection requests. The asserted stored messages do not correspond to the claimed incoming connection request since the user would not be notified if an incoming connection request did not result in a stored message. For at least these reasons, Cannon does not teach the claimed limitations as asserted. Without a presentation of correspondence to each of the claimed limitations, the § 103(a) rejections are improper. Applicant accordingly requests that each of the rejections be withdrawn.

In addition, Applicant fails to recognize where Chihara teaches that a control unit of a cellular core unit is configured to indicate an incoming connection request in a peripheral unit but not in the cellular core unit when an LPRF connection is available. While the discussions of Fig. 1 at paragraphs [0053]-[0055] and Figs. 7-8 at paragraphs [0078]-[0079] as well as apparently cited paragraph [0062] indicate that the mobile telephone device may operate in cooperation with a watch-type apparatus including sending an incoming call arrival signal to the watch-type device, none of the cited portions teaches that the incoming call is not also indicated in the mobile telephone device. Again, without a presentation of correspondence to each of the claimed limitations, the § 103(a) rejections are improper, and Applicant requests that they be withdrawn.

Also, dependent Claims 2-9 and 11-18 depend from independent Claims 1 and 10, respectively, and each of these dependent claims also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the above-discussed combination of Chihara and Cannon. While Applicant does not acquiesce to any particular rejections to these dependent claims, including any assertions concerning descriptive material, obvious design choice and/or what may be otherwise well-known in the art, these rejections are moot in view of the remarks made in connection with independent Claims 1 and 10. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims, and recite additional features which further distinguish these claims from the cited references. "If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious." MPEP § 2143.03; *citing In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, dependent Claims 2-9 and 11-18 are also patentable over the asserted combination of Chihara and Cannon.

With further respect to the § 103(a) rejection of dependent Claims 6 and 15 based upon the asserted combination of Chihara and Cannon and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0224808 by Bonta (hereinafter "Bonta"), Applicant respectfully traverses. As discussed above, the asserted combination of Chihara and Cannon fails to correspond to the limitations of independent Claims 1 and 10 (from which Claims 6 and 15 depend). The further reliance on Bonta does not overcome the above-discussed deficiencies in the underlying combination. Thus, the asserted combination of the teachings of Chihara, Cannon and Bonta does not teach each of the claimed limitations of dependent Claims 6 and 15, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

It should also be noted that Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner's statements or conclusions concerning what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, obvious design choices, common knowledge at the time of Applicant's invention, officially noticed facts, and the like. Applicant reserves the right to address in detail the Examiner's characterizations, conclusions, and rejections in future prosecution.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (KOLS.172US) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the

undersigned attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC  
8009 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, Suite 125  
Minneapolis, MN 55425  
952.854.2700

Date: October 8, 2007

By: Erin M. Nichols

Erin M. Nichols  
Reg. No. 57,125